



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/507,945	02/22/2000	Stephen Williams	200.009255-US(PAR)	2940

7590

07/16/2002

Clarence A Green  
Perman & Green LLP  
425 Post Rd  
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/507,945

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, STEPHEN

Examiner

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4&6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claims 1, 4, and 7-10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a) claim 1/line 15: the phrase "a electronic database" should be changed to --an electronic database--

b) claim 4/line 14: the phrase "said least one" should be changed to --said at least one--

c) claim 7/line 9: the phrase "programs interpretation" should be changed to --program's interpretation--

d) claim 8/line 4 and claim 9/line 5: the phrase "and endless loop" should be changed to --an endless loop--

e) claim 9/lines 1 and 3: the phrase "the a keypad" should be changed to --the keypad--  
Appropriate corrections are required.

f) claim 10/line 6: the word "dependense" should be changed to --dependence--

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by King et al. ("King", US 6,011,554).

As per claim 7, King teaches a communication terminal having:

a display (col.6, line 21);

a keypad having a plurality of keys associated with several letters each (col.2, lines 63-65);

processor means controlling the display means in accordance with the operation of the keypad (col.6, lines 50-52);

a predictive editor program for generating an output containing word matching a received string of ambiguous key strokes (col.3, lines 6-8);

an editor application controlled by the processor means for editing a text based on the predictive editor programs interpretation of key strokes, and comprising:

means for storing string of entered words (col.6, lines 38-40),

means for storing a sequence of key strokes (col.6, lines 38-43), said sequence is updated upon the occurrence of a new key stroke, and being used as input to the predictive editor program (col.7, lines 29-33),

means for storing a list of matching words received from said predictive editor program (col.6, lines 40-43),

said processor means combines the text string and one word from the list of matching words for displaying in the display of at least a part of said text string and one word from the list of matching words, said one word from the list of matching words is marked in comparison to the remaining part of the text string and added to the text string upon acknowledgement by the user (col.7, lines 62-67; col.8, lines 1-3).

As per claim 8, King teaches the keypad to have a key for requesting the processor to replace said one word from the list of matching words, and said processor handling this list of matching words as an endless loop (col.7, lines 58-63; *select key*).

As per claim 9, King teaches the keypad to have a key for requesting input of a special sign (col.7, lines 4-6; *symbols may be used in place of letters*) from a list of special signs in the text string (col.8, lines 1-3; *select key*), and wherein the a keypad has a key for requesting the processor to replace a special sign with the next special sign from the list of special signs, and said processor handling this list of special signs as and endless loop (col.7, lines 62-67; col.8, lines 1-3).

As per claim 10, King teaches the editor application to open a word for editing with the predictive editor program when a cursor is placed at the beginning or the ending of the word, whereby the editor application regenerates a sequence of key strokes based on the presently displayed match, and whereby the editor application adds new key strokes to the regenerated sequence of key strokes in dependence of the position of the cursor and the key pressed (col.20, lines 8-32).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. ("King", US 6,011,554) in view of Frederiksen et al. ("Frederiksen", US 6,185,295).

As per claims 1-3, King teaches a communication terminal having:

a display (col.6, line 21);

a keypad having a plurality of keys associated with several letters each (col.2, lines 63-65);

processor means controlling the display means in accordance with the operation of the keypad (col.6, lines 50-52);

a predictive editor program for generating an output containing word matching a received string of ambiguous key strokes (col.3, lines 6-8), said predictive editor program has a number of associated vocabularies including at least one language dependent

dictionary and at least one dictionary receiving user defined inputs (col.6, lines 58-60; col.22, lines 1-3); and

an editor application controlled by the processor means communicates with said predictive editor programs for generating matching words based on an ambiguous string of key strokes (col.3, lines 6-8).

Furthermore, King teaches the step of copying words into said at least one dictionary for receiving user defined inputs and associated with said predictive editor program from a variety of other sources (col.22, lines 9-11). However, King fails to teach the source to be a second memory means of the communication terminal for storing user inputted data in an electronic database wherein the memory is an electronic phonebook database stored on a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) in a cellular phone. Frederiksen teaches a communication terminal comprising a phonebook database stored on an exchangeable SIM card that can be copied to the memory of the phone (col.3, lines 47-49; fig.4). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Frederiksen's teaching with King's system in order to expand the dictionary to provide additional matching words.

7. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. ("King", US 6,011,554) in view of Schroeder et al. ("Schroeder", US 5,797,098).

As per claims 4-6, King teaches a communication terminal having:

a display (col.6, line 21);

a keypad having a plurality of keys associated with several letters each (col.2, lines 63-65);

Art Unit: 2174

processor means controlling the display means in accordance with the operation of the keypad (col.6, lines 50-52);

a predictive editor program for generating an output containing words matching a received string of ambiguous key strokes (col.3, lines 6-8), said predictive editor program has a number of associated vocabularies including at least one language dependent dictionary and at least one dictionary receiving user defined inputs (col.6, lines 58-60; col.22, lines 1-3); and

an editor application controlled by the processor means communicates with said predictive editor programs for generating matching words based on an ambiguous string of key strokes (col.3, lines 6-8), said editor application stores words that have to be entered in an unambiguous way in one of said at least one dictionary receiving user defined inputs (col.22, lines 1-7).

King teaches the association of a frequency of use to each word (col.13, lines 65-67). However, King fails to teach associated a storing time for the unambiguously entered words stored in the dictionary receiving user defined inputs, updating the storing time every time the word is used, and maintaining the dictionary as a cyclic buffer wherein the word having the oldest storing time is removed from the memory when a new word is added and the buffer is full. Schroeder teaches a communication terminal with a predictive input method wherein a time is associated to each new word, updated each time the word is used (col.7, lines 45-47), and wherein old words are replaced by new words once the buffer is full (col.7, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Schroeder's teaching with King's system in



Art Unit: 2174

order to make efficient use of the system by freeing up memory for words which are entered most frequently.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Will (US 6,392,640) teaches a method of entering words ambiguously and retrieving matching words.
- Balakrishnan et al. (US 5,952,942) teaches a method of inputting words ambiguously and receiving matching words.

### *Inquiries*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (703) 305-3989. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sajeda Muhebbullah  
Patent Examiner  
July 12, 2002

*Kristine Kincaid*  
**KRISTINE KINCAID**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**